

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Edward Siceloff.

DEFENDANT

) Case No.: 2:09-cr-00313-GD-1
)
) Challenge to Jurisdiction
) Motion to Compel Evidence of Jurisdiction
)
) Judge Gustav Diamond
)
)
)
)

HISTORY OF ORIGINAL MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE
OF JURISDICTION

The United States attorneys, representing plaintiff, produced their delegation of authority to pursue United States interests. They have listed no evidence other than that delegation. Defendant's original motion was a motion to compel the production of all evidence that the government has in relation to standing in order to provide the evidence of standing of plaintiff to come against him. The attorneys for the plaintiff have now averred that the motion should be dismissed, while all they have done is elicit information that demonstrates presumption that they do not want to provide evidence for.

REPLY TO GOVERNMENT'S REQUEST TO DENY DEFENDANT'S MOTION

And comes now, this eleventh day of February, 2010, the Defendant, Edward George Siceloff, in reply to government's request to deny motion to dismiss. Defendant did not actually make a motion to dismiss, but rather one to compel evidence of standing on the part of either the United States of America, or its representatives to come against Edward George Siceloff, the Defendant.

I rebut Plaintiffs' claim that standing has been proven thus proving that this court holds jurisdiction over me. Plaintiffs claim lies on the presumption that I am in fact someone that the several states via the federal constitution delegated to Congress the authority to regulate directly, thus making me subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

If this were factual, Plaintiffs standing could in fact have been established by statute.

1 Plaintiff's response did not address whether the defendant is subject to the jurisdiction of the
2 United States, and, thus, no evidence regarding the matter was presented: therefore no proof has
been entered into the record.

3 I dispute this presumption.

4
5 Please see last motion to compel.

6 It is clear that many people are subject to the statutory authority of Congress, but the Supreme
7 Court has clearly held that many people are not.

8 Since the plaintiff is the one making the claim, it is its duty to provide the evidence that I am one
9 of those people within the jurisdiction of the United States of America.

10 I hereby still move this court to compel the Plaintiff to enter into the record a list of all different
11 groups of people that are subject to direct congressional regulation and a list of all groups of
12 people who are not and all possible exceptions to the lists such as those who are not ordinarily
subject to the jurisdiction of the United States but who can become subject under certain
13 circumstances and what those circumstances are.

14 Please clarify any groups the plaintiff thinks apply to me.

15 No final determination can be made until all such evidence is presented and examined carefully.
16
17

18 Respectfully submitted

19 s/ Edward George Siceloff

20 Defendant
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30